REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5, 7 and 11 remain canceled. Claims 6, 10, 15 and 16 have been amended. New claims 17-21 have been added to provide for a more complete claim set. Claims 6, 8-10 and 12-21 remain in the application. Support for the amendments can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

CLAIM 6

Claim 6 recites a method for enhancing a video image, comprising acts of:

inputting video signals representative of the image; and

increasing, using a video signal processor, color saturation of the video signals as a function of (i) color saturation and (ii) proximity of hue of the video signals to a secondary color, wherein the closer the video signal is in hue to a secondary color, the more the video signal color saturation is increased, and wherein the closer the video signal is in hue to primary colors of red, green, and blue, then no enhancement is applied.

Support for the amendments to claim 6 (as well as for amendments to claim 10) can be found in the specification on at least page 2, lines 22-23; and page 3, lines 3-4, as originally filed.

Claims 6, 8-10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bachmann et al. (US Patent 5,282,021, hereafter **Bachmann**). With respect to claim 6, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that
"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."

Therefore, with respect to claim 6, to sustain this rejection the **Bachmann** reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the **Bachmann** reference, the latter reference does not disclose a method of enhancing video images by boost of secondary colors that includes *"increasing*, using a video signal processor, *color saturation* of the video signals as a function of (i) *color saturation* and (ii) *proximity* of *hue* of the video signals to a *secondary color*, wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to a *secondary color*, the *more* the video signal *color saturation* is *increased*, and wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to *primary colors* of red, green, and blue, then *no* enhancement is *applied" [emphasis added]* as is claimed in claim 6. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the **Bachmann** reference and should be withdrawn.

In contrast, the **Bachmann** reference discloses a method and apparatus for color correction of a video signal in which correction signals are derived from the color hue contemporaneously represented in the video signal and in a manner dependent upon setting magnitudes designed to prevent saturation and hue errors (See Bachmann at Col. 1, lines 51-56). With the method and apparatus of **Bachmann**, "a video signal ... has its color hue signal additively corrected by a color correction signal and its saturation signal multiplicatively corrected by a saturation correction signal" (See Bachmann at Col. 1, lines 57-61). In addition, Figure 2B of **Bachmann** illustrates a graphical representation of color hue signal based on a red, green and blue color system, whereas Figure 2C of **Bachmann** illustrates a graphical representation of color hue signal based on a yellow, cyan and magenta color system (See Bachmann at Col. 2, lines 23-26). In further contrast, the **Bachmann** reference discloses that "stored function values for such a triangular format correspond to the known systems

mentioned in the introduction and are illustrated in FIGS. 2B and 2C." (See Bachmann at Col. 3, lines 10-13). Accordingly, the statements of the July 6, 2009 Office Action on page 2 (paragraph 3.) that "Bachmann discloses a video hue correction … color saturation increasing step (note Figure 2c)" and that "[a]ccording to Figure 2c, the saturation of the secondary hues is emphasized while the primary colors are minimized" appear to be mistaken. Thus, the **Bachmann** reference does not disclose a method of enhancing video images by boost of secondary colors that includes "*increasing*, using a video signal processor, *color saturation* of the video signals as a function of (i) *color saturation* and (ii) *proximity* of *hue* of the video signals to a *secondary color*, wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to a *secondary color*, the *more* the video signal *color saturation* is *increased*, and wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to *primary colors* of red, green, and blue, then *no* enhancement is *applied*" as is claimed in claim 6.

Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 8 and 9 depend from and further limit independent claim 6 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

CLAIM 10

Claim 10 recites a method for enhancing a video image, comprising acts of:
inputting video signals representative of the image; and
increasing, using a video signal processor, lightness of the video signals as a function of (i) lightness and (ii) proximity of hue of the video signals to a secondary color, wherein the closer the video signal is in hue to a secondary color, the more the lightness of the video signal is increased, and wherein the closer the video signal is in hue to primary colors of red, green, and blue, then no enhancement is applied.

Support for the amendments to claim claim 10 can be found in the specification on at

least page 2, lines 22-23; and page 3, lines 3-4, as originally filed.

With respect to claim 10, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. To sustain this rejection the **Bachmann** reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the **Bachmann** reference, the latter reference <u>does not</u> disclose a method of enhancing video images by boost of secondary colors that includes "*increasing*, using a video signal processor, *lightness* of the video signals as a function of (i) *lightness* and (ii) *proximity* of *hue* of the video signals to a *secondary color*, wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to a *secondary color*, the *more* the *lightness* of the video signal is *increased*, <u>and</u> wherein the *closer* the video signal is *in hue* to *primary colors* of red, green, and blue, then *no* enhancement is *applied*" *[emphasis added]* as is claimed in claim 10. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the **Bachmann** reference and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, the discussion above regarding the contrasting of the **Bachmann** reference is also applicable with respect to claim 10.

Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 12 and 13 depend from and further limit independent claim 10 and therefore are allowable as well. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Allowance of claims 14 and 17 is noted with appreciation.

Claims 15 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Allowability of claims 15 and 16 is noted with appreciation. By this amendment, claim 15 has been amended to include

the limitations of original base claim 6. Accordingly, claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Claim 16 has also been amended to include the limitations of original base claim 10. Accordingly, claim 16 is in condition for allowance. The objection of the claims has been overcome. Claims 15 and 16 are in prima facie condition for allowance.

New Claims

New claims 18-21 have been added to provide for more complete claim coverage. Support for new claims 18-21 can be found in the specification on at least page 2, lines 18-20; and page 3, lines 2-3 and 12-13, as originally filed, Claims 18-19 depend from and further limit, in a patentable sense, allowable independent claim 15, and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 20-21 depend from and further limit, in a patentable sense, allowable independent claim 16 and therefore are allowable as well.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 6, 10, 14, 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Claims 8-9 depend from and further limit independent claim 6 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 12-13 depend from and further limit independent claim 10 and therefore are allowable as well. Claim 17 depends from and further limits independent claim 14 and therefore is allowable as well. Claims 18-19 depend from and further limit independent claim 15 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 20-21 depend from and further limit independent claim 16 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 6, 8-10 and 12-21 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Balconi-Lamica/

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Edward Goodman, Reg. No. 28,613

Dated:_____September 17, 2009_____
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9611
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: NL040097US2

a-32658.291